REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. A listing of all claims is found at pages 2-8. Please cancel claim 28 without prejudice or disclaimer. During prior prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner has maintained that Renaud et al. (US 5,958,051), Buxton (US 6,182, 279), and/or Evans et al. (US 5,805,899), in combination, make applicants' claimed invention obvious. While not conceding that the cited documents disclose, teach or suggest applicants' originally claimed invention, applicants' representative nevertheless amended claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-18, 22-23, 27, and 30 to more fully emphasize various novel aspects of the subject invention which Renaud et al., Buxton, and Evans et al., alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest.

In particular, Renaud et al. relates to securing and verifying the authenticity of data files that are transferred over computer networks (see col. 3, ln. 25-28); however, Renaud et al. fails to teach or suggest comparing the hash retained in the manifest with a hash of the at least one module obtained at runtime to identify whether a runtime version of the at least one module is substantially similar to a version utilized at build time of the assembly as recited in independent claim 1 (and similarly in independent claims 10, 18, 22, 23, 27, and 30). Additionally, Buxton does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Renaud et al. vis a vis the subject claims, and instead discloses the use of a digital signature that uniquely identifies a component and the vendor or source of the component. (See col. 9, ln. 18-20). Moreover, Evans et al. fails to teach, suggest, or disclose the aforementioned claimed aspects. Evans et al. relates to providing versioning information for a plurality of software objects (see Abstract); however, Evans et al. utilizes a link-editor that adds version names, which are defined in human made mapfiles, to a version definition section at build time, and matches to the version names at runtime. (See col. 2, In. 6-36). Thus, Evans et al. fails to teach or suggest comparing the hash retained in the manifest with a hash of the at least one module as recited in independent claim 1 (and similarly in independent claims 10, 18, 22, 23, 27, and 30).

Accordingly, it is believed that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

09/604,987

MS146910.01/MSFTP119US

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above amendments and comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP

Himanshu S. Amin Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP 24TH Floor, National City Center 1900 E. 9TH Street Cleveland, Ohio 44114 Telephone (216) 696-8730 Facsimile (216) 696-8731